

City Council Chambers 3300 Capitol Avenue Fremont, California

City Council

Bob Wasserman, Mayor

Bob Wieckowski, Vice Mayor

Anu Natarajan

Bill Harrison

Suzanne Lee Chan

City Staff

Fred Diaz, City Manager
Harvey E. Levine, City Attorney
Annabell Holland, Interim Assistant City
Manager/Parks & Recreation Director

Dawn G. Abrahamson, City Clerk
Robert Beyer, Interim Community Dev. Director
Harriet Commons, Finance Director
Marilyn Crane, Information Technology Svcs. Dir.
Mary Kaye Fisher, Interim Human Resources Dir.
Norm Hughes, City Engineer
Bruce Martin, Fire Chief
Jim Pierson, Transportation & Ops Director
Jeff Schwob, Planning Director
Suzanne Shenfil, Human Services Director
Craig Steckler, Chief of Police
Lori Taylor, Economic Development Director
Elisa Tierney, Redevelopment Director

City Council Agenda and Report [Redevelopment Agency of Fremont]

General Order of Business

- 1. Preliminary
 - Call to Order
 - Salute to the Flag
 - Roll Call
- 2. Consent Calendar
- 3. Ceremonial Items
- 4. Public Communications
- 5. Scheduled Items
 - Public Hearings
 - Appeals
 - Reports from Commissions, Boards and Committees
- 6. Report from City Attorney
- 7. Other Business
- 8. Council Communications
- 9. Adjournment

Order of Discussion

Generally, the order of discussion after introduction of an item by the Mayor will include comments and information by staff followed by City Council questions and inquiries. The applicant, or their authorized representative, or interested citizens, may then speak on the item; each speaker may only speak once to each item. At the close of public discussion, the item will be considered by the City Council and action taken. Items on the agenda may be moved from the order listed.

Consent Calendar

Items on the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine by the City Council and will be enacted by one motion and one vote. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a Councilmember or citizen so requests, in which case the item will be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered separately. Additionally, other items without a "Request to Address the City Council" card in opposition may be added to the consent calendar. The City Attorney will read the title of ordinances to be adopted.

Agenda and Report • Fremont City Council Meeting • October 26, 2010



Addressing the Council

Any person may speak once on any item under discussion by the City Council after receiving recognition by the Mayor. Speaker cards will be available prior to and during the meeting. To address City Council, a card must be submitted to the City Clerk indicating name, address and the number of the item upon which a person wishes to speak. When addressing the City Council, please walk to the lectern located in front of the City Council. State your name. In order to ensure all persons have the opportunity to speak, a time limit will be set by the Mayor for each speaker (see instructions on speaker card). In the interest of time, each speaker may only speak once on each individual agenda item; please limit your comments to new material; do not repeat what a prior speaker has said.

Oral Communications

Any person desiring to speak on a matter which is not scheduled on this agenda may do so under the Oral Communications section of Public Communications. Please submit your speaker card to the City Clerk prior to the commencement of Oral Communications. Only those who have submitted cards prior to the beginning of Oral Communications will be permitted to speak. Please be aware the California Government Code prohibits the City Council from taking any immediate action on an item which does not appear on the agenda, unless the item meets stringent statutory requirements. The Mayor will limit the length of your presentation (see instructions on speaker card) and each speaker may only speak once on each agenda item.

To leave a voice message for all Councilmembers and the Mayor simultaneously, dial 284-4080.

The City Council Agendas may be accessed by computer at the following Worldwide Web Address: www.fremont.gov

Information

Copies of the Agenda and Report are available in the lobbies of the Fremont City Hall, 3300 Capitol Avenue and the Development Services Center, 39550 Liberty Street, on Friday preceding a regularly scheduled City Council meeting. Supplemental documents relating to specific agenda items are available at the Office of the City Clerk.

The regular meetings of the Fremont City Council are broadcast on Cable Television Channel 27 and can be seen via webcast on our website (www.Fremont.gov).

Assistance will be provided to those requiring accommodations for disabilities in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Interested persons must request the accommodation at least 2 working days in advance of the meeting by contacting the City Clerk at (510) 284-4060. Council meetings are *open captioned* for the deaf in the Council Chambers and *closed captioned* for home viewing.

Availability of Public Records

All disclosable public records relating to an open session item on this agenda that are distributed by the City to all or a majority of the City Council less than 72 hours prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection in specifically labeled binders located in the lobby of Fremont City Hall, 3300 Capitol Avenue during normal business hours, at the time the records are distributed to the City Council.

Information about the City or items scheduled on the Agenda and Report may be referred to:

Address: City Clerk

City of Fremont

3300 Capitol Avenue, Bldg. A

Fremont, California 94538

Telephone: (510) 284-4060

Your interest in the conduct of your City's business is appreciated.

CLOSED SESSION NOTICE AND AGENDA OF SPECIAL MEETING

CITY OF FREMONT

DATE: Tuesday, October 26, 2010

TIME: 6:30 p.m.

LOCATION: Fremont Room, 3300 Capitol Avenue, Fremont

The City will convene a special meeting. It is anticipated the City will immediately adjourn the meeting to a closed session to confer with and receive advice from its attorney regarding existing litigation in one matter, as follows:

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - EXISTING LITIGATION

This Closed Session is authorized by subdivision (a) of Section 54956.9 of the Government Code and will pertain to existing litigation in one matter.

John Freeman v. City of Fremont, Case No. RG10541529

This Special Meeting is being called by Mayor Wasserman.

AGENDA FREMONT CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING OCTOBER 26, 2010 COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 3300 CAPITOL AVE., BUILDING A 7:00 P.M.

1. PRELIMINARY

- 1.1 Call to Order
- 1.2 Salute the Flag
- 1.3 Roll Call
- 1.4 Announcements by Mayor / City Manager

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

Items on the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine by the City Council and will be enacted by one motion and one vote. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a Councilmember or citizen so requests, in which event the item will be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered separately. Additionally, other items without a "Request to Address Council" card in opposition may be added to the consent calendar. The City Attorney will read the title of ordinances to be adopted.

- 2.1 Motion to Waive Further Reading of Proposed Ordinances (This permits reading the title only in lieu of reciting the entire text.)
- 2.2 Approval of Minutes for the Regular Meeting of October 12, 2010, the Special and Regular Meetings of July 27, 2010, the Special and Joint City Council and Redevelopment Agency Work Session Meetings of July 20, 2010, the Regular Meeting of July 13, 2010, the Special and Regular Meetings of July 6, 2010, and the Work Session and Regular Meeting Minutes of June 15, 2010
- 2.3 Second Reading and Adoption of an Ordinance of the City of Fremont Rezoning Property Located at 44411 Mission Boulevard from Open Space (O-S) to Single Family Residence (R-1-6) Hillside Combining District (H-I)
 - RECOMMENDATION: Adopt ordinance.
- 2.4 LEASE AGREEMENT PATTERSON RESERVOIR OUTDOOR FIRING AND TARGET RANGE

Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Ten-Year Lease Agreement with Alameda County Water District for an Outdoor Firing and Target Range Located near Patterson Reservoir

Contact Person:

Name:Randy SabadoNorm HughesTitle:Real Property ManagerCity Engineer

Dept.: Community Development Community Development

Phone: 510-494-4715 510-494-4748

E-Mail: rsabado@fremont.gov nhughes@fremont.gov

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Authorize the City Manager or his designee to execute a ten year lease agreement with Alameda County Water District for a five acre site located near Patterson Reservoir.

- 2. Appropriate \$268,000 of the available Capital Projects Fund (fund 501) fund balance to 501PWC8475, "Police Firing Range Lead Abatement" and restrict \$425,000 of the fund's cash and investments account for purposes of securing the City's clean-up obligations under the lease.
- 3. **CEREMONIAL ITEMS None.**
- 4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS
 - 4.1 Oral and Written Communications

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY - None.

PUBLIC FINANCING AUTHORITY - None.

CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT CALENDAR

5. SCHEDULED ITEMS

5.1 INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES ADOPTING AND AMENDING THE 2010 CALIFORNIA BUILDING STANDARDS CODES AND CERTAIN APPENDIX CHAPTERS OF THE 2010 CALIFORNIA BUILDING STANDARDS CODES Introduce and Consider Ordinances and Findings Adopting and Amending the 2010 California Building Standards Code and Adopting by Reference Certain Appendix Chapters of the 2010 California Building Standards Codes, and Making Conforming Changes to the Fremont Municipal Code

Contact Person:

Name: Steven W. Davis Jay Swardenski Title: Building Official Fire Marshal

Dept.: Community Development Fire

Phone: 510-494-4470 510-494-4222

E-Mail: swdavis@fremont.gov jswardenski@fremont.gov

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Hold public hearing.
- 2. Waive full reading and introduce ordinances adopting and amending to the 2010 California Building, Electrical, Plumbing, Mechanical, Residential, Green Building, Existing Building, and Fire Codes.
- 3. Direct staff to prepare and the City Clerk to publish a summary of the proposed ordinances.
- 4. Direct the City Clerk to publish a notice of public hearing to consider adoption of the ordinances in accordance with Government Code Section 6066 and 50022.3.

5.2 PATTERSON RANCH PLANNED DISTRICT

Public Hearing (Published Notice) to Consider a Planning Commission Recommendation for Certification of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and approval of a General Plan Amendment, Preliminary and Precise Planned District and Development Agreement for up to 500 Residential Units on 101 Acres Generally Located Northeast of the Intersection of Paseo Padre Parkway and Ardenwood Boulevard in the Northern Plain Planning Area (PLN2005-00186)

Contact Person:

Name:Scott RuhlandJeff SchwobTitle:Associate PlannerPlanning Director

Dept.: Community Development Community Development

Phone: 510-494-4453 510-494-4527

E-Mail: sruhland@fremont.gov jschwob@fremont.gov

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1. Hold public hearing.
- 2. Adopt a resolution certifying that the Final Environmental Impact Report (Exhibit "A") has been completed in compliance with the requirements of CEQA, and that the City Council has considered the information contained in the Final EIR and that it reflects the City Council's independent judgment and analysis; making findings of fact related to impacts, and adopting a mitigation monitoring and reporting program and a statement of overriding considerations.
- 3. Adopt a resolution approving a General Plan Land Use Amendment from Open Space, 0.25-1 unit/acre, Study Area #12 and Urban Reserve to Residential Low, 4-6 units per acre, and eliminating the "Study Area" designation on lands westerly of Ardenwood Boulevard as shown on Exhibit "B" (General Plan Amendment Land Use Diagram).
- 4. Waive full reading and introduce an ordinance Rezoning the subject property

from Agriculture and Agriculture (Flood Combining) to Planned District P-2005-186, as shown on Exhibit "C" (Planned District Rezoning Map), and a Preliminary and Precise Planned District P-2005-186 as shown on Exhibit "D" (Illustrative Plan, Precise Site Plan, Lot Plans, Landscape Plans and Park Design Details and Community Building Floor Plan and Elevations) finding the project conforms to the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan Small Lot Single Family Design Guidelines, with the development standards design guidelines set forth in Exhibit "E" and subject to findings and conditions as set forth in Exhibit "G."

5. Find the Development Agreement, as shown on Exhibit "F," fulfills the applicable requirements set forth in the Fremont Municipal Code based upon findings set forth in Exhibit "G," and waive full reading and introduce an ordinance approving a the Development Agreement.

6. REPORT FROM CITY ATTORNEY

- 6.1 Report Out from Closed Session of Any Final Action
- 7. **OTHER BUSINESS** None.
- 8. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS
 - 8.1 Council Referrals None.
 - 8.2 Oral Reports on Meetings and Events
- 9. ADJOURNMENT



*2.3 Second Reading and Adoption of an Ordinance of the City of Fremont Rezoning Property Located at 44411 Mission Boulevard from Open Space (O-S) to Single Family Residence (R-1-6) Hillside Combining District (H-I)

ENCLOSURE: Draft Ordinance

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt ordinance.

*2.4 LEASE AGREEMENT - PATTERSON RESERVOIR OUTDOOR FIRING AND TARGET RANGE

Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Ten-Year Lease Agreement with Alameda County Water District for an Outdoor Firing and Target Range Located near Patterson Reservoir

Contact Person:

Name: Randy Sabado Norm Hughes Title: Real Property Manager City Engineer

Dept.: Community Development Community Development

Phone: 510-494-4715 510-494-4748

E-Mail: rsabado@fremont.gov nhughes@fremont.gov

......

Executive Summary: The purpose of this report is to recommend that the City Council authorize the City Manager to execute a new ten year lease agreement with Alameda County Water District (ACWD) for a five acre site located near Patterson Reservoir to continue use of the site as an outdoor firing and target range.

BACKGROUND: The City of Fremont Police Department has used a site on top of a hill south of Coyote Hills Regional Park near the Patterson Reservoir as a firing range since 1971. The use of the land was first authorized through a lease agreement with ACWD and the Fremont Police Association and then through a lease with the City of Fremont. The current lease has expired and ACWD has allowed the Police Department to use the range on a month to month basis while the City prepared and submitted for ACWD approval a work plan to remove lead contamination in the soil following termination of the firing range use at the site.

DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS: ACWD has provided the Police Department with a safe and remote outdoor range for one dollar a year for almost forty years. The range has provided a low cost facility which allows the department to train its officers in realistic conditions.

This lease agreement allows the City to continue to use the facility for an additional ten years with the ability to extend the agreement. It also provides that either party may terminate the agreement by providing at least one hundred and eighty days prior written notice. The lease establishes an agreement and timeline for cleaning up the site of lead which has accumulated over the years, before the City vacates the property and obligates the City to repair and maintain an access road to the site. As discussed below, the lease requires that the City demonstrate it has a source of funds available to implement the site clean-up.

Current Project Budget: 02/03 CIP appropriation Fund 501 Capital Improvement 07/08 CIP appropriation Fund 501 Capital Improvement Total appropriated to project:	\$50,000 <u>\$250,000</u> \$300,000
Project Expenditures:	
Current staff costs on project for environmental work	\$14,000
Current consultant costs for environmental work	\$114,000
(Environmental work includes: conducting testing needed	
to complete a Phase II Environmental Assessment;	
preparing a remediation plan and obtaining approvals;	
scheduling and providing construction management	
through completion of the remediation)	
Future staff expenses for cleanup work	\$15,000
Future contract cleanup costs form updated cost estimate	<u>\$425,000</u>
Total funding required for project	\$568,000
Additional Funding Required from 501 Capital Improvement Fund Balance	<u>\$268,000</u>

FISCAL IMPACT: An environmental assessment completed in 1996 estimated the probable cost of lead abatement at approximately \$270,000. In the fiscal year 2002-2003 Capital Improvement Program (CIP), \$50,000 was budgeted to begin the project studies for removal of the lead contamination. In fiscal year 2007-2008 the CIP budgeted an additional \$250,000 to include funding to remove the lead, bringing the total amount budgeted to \$300,000. This past year a work plan was developed and submitted to ACWD for approval and the 1996 remediation cost estimate was updated to a new cost estimate of \$425,000 for the clean-up costs. If the City Council approves this lease renewal, it is asked to appropriate from Fund 501 an additional \$268,000 to 501PWC8475, and to restrict \$425,000 of the fund's cash and investments account for clean-up purposes. Doing so will allow the City to show compliance with the terms of the new lease.

The lease agreement provides that the City will hold appropriated funds equaling the total estimated costs to remediate the property in its Capital Projects fund balance. ACWD has allowed these funds to function as security for the site clean-up instead of requiring the City to post either a cash or bond deposit with either ACWD or an independent escrow holder. The City will evaluate the cost to remediate the site at least once every two years and if the total estimated cost to remediate has increased by 10% or more, the City must increase amounts held in the Capital Projects fund for the site clean up project. The City cannot reduce or eliminate the amount of funds held for the remediation of the site without prior written consent of ACWD. In addition the City will submit to ACWD annually a letter signed by the City's Finance Director stating the City has sufficient funds secured to remediate the property.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: The proposed lease agreement continues the use of the existing firing range and includes the pre-existing lease terms and ongoing obligation for cleanup and lead removal related to current City use of the facility. The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Guideline 15301 as a continuation of use of an existing facility that does not

expand the range or types of uses. The future development and implementation of the lead removal and cleanup plan will be subject to independent project review and oversight by appropriate agencies; this is likely to include ACWD and the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC).

ENCLOSURE: Map outlining the property

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1. Authorize the City Manager or his designee to execute a ten year lease agreement with Alameda County Water District for a five acre site located near Patterson Reservoir.
- 2. Appropriate \$268,000 of the available Capital Projects Fund (fund 501) fund balance to 501PWC8475, "Police Firing Range Lead Abatement" and restrict \$425,000 of the fund's cash and investments account for purposes of securing the City's clean-up obligations under the lease.

5.1 INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES ADOPTING AND AMENDING THE 2010 CALIFORNIA BUILDING STANDARDS CODES AND CERTAIN APPENDIX CHAPTERS OF THE 2010 CALIFORNIA BUILDING STANDARDS CODES Introduce and Consider Ordinances and Findings Adopting and Amending the 2010 California Building Standards Code and Adopting by Reference Certain Appendix Chapters of the 2010 California Building Standards Codes, and Making Conforming Changes to the Fremont Municipal Code

Contact Person:

Name: Steven W. Davis Jay Swardenski Title: Building Official Fire Marshal

Dept.: Community Development Fire

Phone: 510-494-4470 510-494-4222

E-Mail: swdavis@fremont.gov jswardenski@fremont.gov

Executive Summary: This agenda item introduces and schedules the public hearing for November 23, 2010 for the adoption of the California Building Standards Codes and proposes local amendments for Council consideration.

The State of California adopts a set of new construction codes every three years referred to as the California Building Standards Code. The purpose of this agenda item is to amend the 2010 California Building Standards Code that automatically becomes effective January 1, 2011 with certain administrative provisions and some technical provisions based on Fremont's local conditions. The proposed administrative and technical amendments carry forward current provisions in the Fremont Building and Fire Codes. These mainly relate to the fire resistivity of high-rise rooftops, exterior walls, exit corridors, and the separation of residential units from incompatible occupancies. Additional provisions allow larger additions to single-family homes before retrofitting the entire structure with a fire extinguishing system or separating it from the existing structure. There are also some structural changes required to address some code deficiencies and to address local conditions due to the proximity of Fremont to the Hayward earthquake fault.

BACKGROUND: The California Building Standards Commission (CBSC) is an independent commission within the State and Consumer Services Agency responsible for reviewing, adopting, and publishing building standards for the State of California. Every three years, the CBSC adopts a compilation of building regulations referred to as the California Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations Title 24). Included in these regulations are provisions of the California Building, Fire, Plumbing, Mechanical, Electrical, Residential, Green Building and Existing Building Codes. Through the code adoption process, the CBSC selects and approves a model code. Participating State agencies, such as State Fire Marshal (SFM), Division of the State Architect (DSA) and Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD) have an opportunity to amend the code for the occupancy groups under their respective authorities. Local governments or jurisdictions can then modify the code to add more restrictive provisions based on their specific local geologic, climatic and topographic conditions. The administrative provisions of the code can be modified without specific justification.

The 2010 Codes become effective on January 1, 2011; however, the specific code addition applicable to a building project is established by the building permit application date. Therefore, projects submitted for a permit on or after January 1, 2011 must be designed to the 2010 edition of the California Building Codes.

Discussion: The City of Fremont has historically amended the California Building Standards Code in the areas listed below. The proposed amendments represent a continuation of the local amendments currently in effect in the City of Fremont plus the adoption of the newly created California Residential Code and the California Green Building Code. A brief discussion of the local amendments to the 2010 California Building Standards Code and the changes under this ordinance follows.\

- 1. Administrative
- 2. Soils Reports, Investigation and Soils Observation
- 3. Structural Observation
- 4. Roof Coverings
- 5. Fire Resistant Construction, Occupancy Separation and Exiting
- 6. Wood Structures and Prescriptive Conventional Construction
- 7. Plumbing Amendments
- 8. Mechanical Code
- 9. Automatic Fire Extinguishing Systems
- 10. General Fire Code Amendments
- 11. Structural amendments
- 12. Uniform Housing Code and the Uniform Code for the Abatement of Dangerous Buildings.
- 13. Appendix chapters in 2010 California Building Code
- 14. California Residential Code
- 15. California Green Building Code

1-Administrative Amendments: The administrative amendments for the Building, Electrical, Mechanical, Plumbing, Residential and Fire codes define: when work requires a building permit; the information required to obtain the permit; its validity and expiration; the terms and conditions of an application and building permits as well as any required review, inspection and observations, penalties and violations; and the authority of the Building Official and Fire Marshal. Further, the local amendments, require plats of survey when deemed necessary, require soil observation and structural observation, require the issuance of certificates of occupancy at the time of occupancy changes, refine conditions of temporary certificates of occupancy and remove the code restriction allowing a one-time only extension of building permits. A new table is also being added that ranks relative hazards between different occupancies and establishes when installation of fire sprinklers will be required when a building changes occupancy group. Identical provisions are currently in effect in the City of Fremont.

2-Soils Reports, Investigation and Soils Observation: The proposed amendments in this area allow the use of existing soils reports, when an addition is matched to the existing foundation system. Observation of foundation excavation and boring by the original soils engineer is still required. The soils report requirement continues to be exempt for additions less than 50% when the building site is not within a seismic landslide hazard zone, or when the Building Official waives the report requirement for other minor additions and accessory buildings. All current soil investigations and foundation observations are being carried forward into the current code.

- **3-Structural Inspection:** Fremont amendments requiring structural inspections remain.
- **4-Roof Coverings:** The only amendment to this code section requires certified roofs materials.

5-Fire Resistant Construction, Occupancy Separation and Exiting: The 2010 state codes continue to rely heavily on the installation of fire sprinkler systems. Under the 2010 code, a fire extinguishing system can be used to increase the overall building height and area, reduce the fire resistivity of its structural elements, exterior walls and exit corridors, eliminate separations between incompatible occupancies, reduce fire rated construction separating units in multi-unit residential occupancies. The California State Fire Marshal's Office (SFM) again rejected some of these provisions for occupancy groups under their authority and limited the use of fire sprinkler systems to either increase floor area or height, but not both. The SFM also does not allow a sprinkler system to be used to reduce the required fire resistant construction of roof-tops, exit corridors, and occupancy separations between units of multi-unit residential units. Since the State Fire Marshal amendments do not apply to office and business occupancies (B), factories (F), storages and parking garages (S), and other miscellaneous and utilities (U) buildings, staff is proposing to extend the same protections to these occupancy groups.

The following are general descriptions of local amendments regarding fire resistant construction and exiting:

Roof of High-rise buildings: Eliminate an exception that would allow combustible construction for the roof of high-rise building

Exterior walls: Extend SFM amendments to all occupancies requiring for fire resistance covering on the inside face of exterior walls. The spread of fire from one building to the next is not occupancy dependent and can be crucial in event of a post earthquake fire.

Fire separation between sleeping units and dwelling units: Maintain fire resistance of walls separating sleeping units in hotels and motels and extend this amendment to duplexes. This code provision is already required for all other multi-unit residential buildings. Further the proposed amendments do not allow a reduction of rated floor or wall assemblies from 1 hour to ½ hour in all duplexes and multi-residential hotels and motels.

Fire resistance of exit corridors: Maintain fire resistance construction of 1 hour for exit corridors. The rated fire corridor is a critical element of fire exit system and all occupants of a building should have the same degree of protection in the event of a post earthquake fire.

Separation from garages and parking structure: Extend the 1-hour fire separation between the garage and habitable areas in single family residences, duplexes, apartments, condominiums or townhomes. This effectively maintains the current 5/8" gypsum wall thickness of the separation walls to provide slightly higher degree of fire resistivity. Additional 1-hour fire separations are required between residential occupancies and attached parking garages, business, retail spaces, factory and storage buildings.

Number of exits in multi-unit residential occupancies, including apartments and long-term Hotels and Motels: Maintain the requirement for two exits for buildings three stories high and above.

6-Wood Structures and Prescriptive Conventional Construction: The current local amendment disallowing certain types of wall coverings for seismic load-resisting elements which have performed poorly in recent earthquakes remains unchanged.

7-California Plumbing Code: The proposed amendments are administrative and similar to amendments currently in place in the City of Fremont.

8-California Mechanical Code: The protection of hoods and ducts in an enclosure by fire rated materials is to restrict grease duct fires to the hood and duct and prevent it from spreading to the rest of the building. There have been a number of grease duct fires in Fremont in single story buildings. These fires have been contained by shafts. If it were not a rated shaft, the fire would spread to the roof very easily. The proposed amendment to California Mechanical Code will ensure the shaft is constructed as a fire rated shaft.

9-Automatic Fire Extinguishing Systems: Most requirements for Automatic Fire Extinguishing Systems (AFES) are being continued from the previous ordinance, with text and structure changes made for clarity. One noteworthy change is a provision to add up to 500 square feet to any residence, with an overall cap of 5,000 square feet, before triggering a retrofit requirement. This, in effect is an equity adjustment in the retrofit requirements, while still requiring all new structures and larger additions to structures (>50% of original square footage) to provide Automatic Fire Extinguishing Systems (AFES).

10-General California Fire Code Amendments: Several sections of the California Fire Code (CFC) related to fire alarm specifications and hazardous materials are again amended to allow the Fire Department greater flexibility and application of life safety and property conservation controls. These can be summarized as follows:

- Fire Alarm System installation and monitoring requirements have been clarified.
- Spill control and secondary containment mechanisms are required for a wider range of hazardous materials and at lower thresholds.
- Fireworks and Pyrotechnic Special Effects sections have been amended to carry forward language consistent with the continued ban on the sale and possession of "Safe and Sane Fireworks."
- Additional construction and monitoring requirements have been crafted for hazardous materials with CFC health hazard classifications of 3 and 4, mainly the toxic and highly toxic materials. Some flammable and oxidizing materials will also be covered by these changes.

The remaining technical changes are consistent with the existing amendments currently in effect in the City of Fremont.

11-Structural:

Suspended Ceiling: Local amendment for the California Building Code has no information regarding seismic design requirements for suspended ceilings. It is through the experience of prior earthquakes, such as the Northridge Earthquake, that this amendment is proposed to minimize the amount of bodily and building damage where these ceilings are installed. Since a great deal of emphasis has been placed on sprinkler systems, all measures that further ensure the sprinkler system will function after an

earthquake is of great importance to Fremont due to it proximity to Hayward Fault. All other proposed structural amendments are based on Uniform Code Committee and regional branches of Structural Engineers Association of California recommendations.

12-Uniform Housing Code and the Uniform Code for the Abatement of Dangerous Buildings: The changes to the Uniform Housing Code and the Uniform Code for the Abatement of Dangerous Buildings are administrative and identical to those currently in place. These minor amendments are necessary to conform to changes in the section numbering in the building codes.

13-California Building Code Appendixes: The proposed ordinance adopts the following appendix chapters of the 2010 California Building Code, Volume 2:

Appendix Chapter C: This appendix chapter contains provisions for the construction of agricultural buildings. The same provisions are currently in effect in the City of Fremont.

Appendix Chapter I (H in Residential Code): This appendix chapter contains requirements for patio covers. The same provisions are currently in effect in the City of Fremont.

Appendix Chapter G (Residential Code): This appendix chapter contains provisions for private Swimming Pools, Spas & Hot tubs.

Appendix Chapter K (Residential Code): This appendix chapter contains provisions for sound transmission between attached dwelling units.

14-California Residential Code: The proposed amendments are administrative and identical to amendments to California Building Code. They include requirements for fire-sprinklers and separation between garage and dwelling. Use of brittle materials is prohibited for bracing of dwellings.

15-California Green Building Code: Communities have a number of options on the level of green building requirements appropriate to be adopted in their community. The proposed amendments include requirements for compliance with mandatory features of the Green Building Code plus mandatory compliance with Tier I requirements for new residential buildings. Mandatory Tier I compliance would require: 15% reduction in overall energy use, 20% reduction in water consumption, 20% reduction in wastewater discharge, 20% of paved surfaces to be permeable pavement, water efficient landscape design, 20% reduction in foundation concrete, 10% of construction materials to include recycled content, 65% of construction waste diverted from landfill, 80% of resilient flooring material to meet minimum VOC materials standard, and insulation materials must meet minimum VOC materials standards. As an alternative to meeting the mandatory Tier I requirements, a project may achieve at least 50 points from the GreenPoint Checklist available at www.greenpointrated.org. Based on communications with representatives from the residential development community they support the proposed level of mandatory green building requirements for new residential buildings.

Staff is not recommending that the City adopt additional mandatory green building requirements for new commercial projects at this time. The existing outreach and engagement activities employed has not been effective to connect with commercial developers to gauge their views regarding new green building requirements; this fact coupled with the current difficult economic climate leads staff to recommend no new requirements at this time. If the City Council is interested in exploring additional commercial green building requirements, staff would develop an expanded engagement process to lead to a more informed recommendation for the City Council.

Public Meetings: Individuals and firms interested in this cycle of the code adoption were invited to attend a public meeting held on October 13, 2010 at 12-noon and at 6:00 pm to offer their suggestions and perspectives and Building and Fire staff were available to answer questions and provide detailed information regarding the proposed code adoptions and the local amendments. Only two interested individuals attended this meeting, one representing the residential development community and one representing the commercial development community. The questions and discussion focused on the City's plans regarding adoption of the new Green Building Code.

Support was offered for the proposed mandatory Tier 1 green building compliance for new residential projects, but there was no support for requiring any additional mandatory requirements for commercial projects.

Resolution of Local Condition Findings: Health and Safety Code Sections 17958, 17958.5 and 17958.7 require the City Council to make findings regarding local climatic, geological and topographical conditions before adopting local amendments to the State-adopted California Building Standards Code. The proposed findings are enclosed with this staff report; however, the City Council will not be asked to adopt the findings by resolution until the second reading of the ordinances on November 23, 2010.

The proposed findings specify the local climatic, geological and topographical conditions that support changes in the building codes. The proposed amendments to the building codes are based primarily on earthquake and climatic conditions.

The proposed findings specify the local climatic, geological and topographical conditions that support the proposed amendments to the fire code and specific changes related to the minimum requirements for the installation of Automatic Fire Sprinkler Systems in certain types of apartment buildings.

FISCAL IMPACT: The costs associated with the application and administration of the building standards in the City of Fremont are funded by user fees paid by developers. The proposed code adoption would not change the current cost for these services and would not require any change to the currently adopted permit fee schedule.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: The proposed action does not meet the definition of "project" as defined by CEQA. No further environmental review is necessary.

ENCLOSURES:

- Proposed findings
- Draft ordinance adopting and amending the 2010 California Building, Plumbing, Mechanical, Electrical, Existing Building, Residential, and Green Building Codes
- Draft ordinance adopting and amending the 2010 California Fire Code

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. Hold public hearing.
- 2. Waive full reading and introduce ordinances adopting and amending to the 2010 California Building, Electrical, Plumbing, Mechanical, Residential, Green Building, Existing Building, and Fire Codes.

3. 4.	Direct staff to prepare and the City Clerk to publish a summary of the proposed ordinances. Direct the City Clerk to publish a notice of public hearing to consider adoption of the ordinances in accordance with Government Code Section 6066 and 50022.3.

5.2 PATTERSON RANCH PLANNED DISTRICT

Public Hearing (Published Notice) to Consider a Planning Commission Recommendation for Certification of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and approval of a General Plan Amendment, Preliminary and Precise Planned District and Development Agreement for up to 500 Residential Units on 101 Acres Generally Located Northeast of the Intersection of Paseo Padre Parkway and Ardenwood Boulevard in the Northern Plain Planning Area (PLN2005-00186)

Contact Person:

Name: Scott Ruhland Jeff Schwob
Title: Associate Planner Planning Director

Dept.: Community Development Community Development

Phone: 510-494-4453 510-494-4527

E-Mail: sruhland@fremont.gov jschwob@fremont.gov

.....

Executive Summary: The applicant is requesting approval of a General Plan Amendment (GPA), Preliminary and Precise Planned District (PD) and Development Agreement (DA) and for the development of up to 500 single-family residential units and associated parks, trails, streets and utilities. The project site is approximately 101 acres and located at the northeast quadrant of the Ardenwood Boulevard and Paseo Padre Parkway intersection in the Northern Plain Planning Area. The applicant has made several proposals for this site and a Draft Environmental Impact Report was published for a larger scale project in late 2009. The applicant has since substantially revised the project to the current proposal. A new Re-circulated Draft Environmental Impact (RDEIR) was prepared for the new project and released for public review from June 20 to August 4, 2010. A Final EIR was then prepared and the Council must certify the FEIR before it may approve the project. The Planning Commission recommended the project to City Council on a 7-0 vote on September 30, 2010.

Planning Commission Recommendation: This project was considered by the Planning Commission at the September 23, 2010 public hearing. Due to the number of public speakers and length of discussion, the public hearing was continued to September 30, 2010. The primary topic areas raised at the public hearing were the following:

- ➤ Geologic impacts related to liquefaction and lateral spreading;
- Existing pesticide and insecticide contamination of the site and remediation process;
- ➤ Cultural resource impacts and mitigation;
- > Impacts to schools;
- ➤ Increased traffic:
- Overall appropriateness of the project.

As identified by the Planning Commission, the project impacts are adequately discussed in the FEIR, and appropriate mitigation has been identified. The Mitigation and Monitoring Report Program (MMRP) identifies the impact, mitigation measure, timing and responsible agency for ensuring mitigation is completed. The Commission considered all testimony given at the public hearing and deliberated the project with questions to staff and EIR consultants. The Commission voted 7-0 to recommend the project to City Council with consideration of an additional condition to provide a

program to facilitate the installation of solar panels. Staff has included a condition (A-40) which provides that home builders provide one model home for each phase of development to include solar panels so potential buyers have a better understanding of the costs and benefits of solar energy.

BACKGROUND: The Patterson Ranch project is located on land originally owned by George Patterson and is the last remaining collection of parcels owned by the Patterson Family. This land was designated as a Study Area and Urban Reserve in the 1991 General Plan after development of the Ardenwood-Forest New Town project in the 1980's. Development of the property has been envisioned in the General Plan since the 1970's. The City's Study Area designation is used to identify property that is intended for development after appropriate studies and analysis have been completed. The project currently proposed for the property has evolved over the last 10 years, originally envisioned as 1,800 homes, now capped at a maximum of 500 homes. A substantial amount of study and analysis has been conducted in order to fully evaluate the project and allow it to move through the public hearing process for consideration.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant is requesting approval for a General Plan land use amendment and rezoning for the eventual development of 101 acres of vacant land into a new residential community with up to 500 single family homes on 80 acres and 21 acres of parks and trails. New streets, utilities and other infrastructure will also be developed to support the residential community. The homes will be built on various lot sizes including:

TOTAL	500 homes	1,925 - 2,740 sq ft*	0.44 - 0.64*
3,300 square feet	104	1,700-2,200 square feet	0.52 - 0.66
4,000 square feet	64	1,725-2,600 square feet	0.43 - 0.65
4,500 square feet	148	2,000-2,750 square feet	0.44 - 0.69
5,000 square feet	36	2,000-2,750 square feet	0.40 - 0.55
5,400 square feet	148	2,200-3,400 square feet	0.40 - 0.63
Lot Size	Number of Lots	Home Sizes	FAR Range

^{*}Represents average square footage and FAR

A second scenario was also proposed and considered in the EIR that consists of 448 single-family homes and 72 multi-family homes for a total of 520 units. However, the applicant has chosen to remove this scenario from consideration and is seeking approval for 500 single-family units only.

Site Density & Open Space

- \triangleright 500 homes on 101 gross acres = **4.95 units per acre**
- \triangleright 21 acres open space on 101 gross acres = **20.7% open space**

Other aspects of the project include:

- Improvement to Ardenwood Boulevard including a new signalized intersection with Ranch Drive, widening to three lanes, bike lanes, landscaping, sidewalks and frontage improvements.
- ➤ 21 acres of neighborhood parks, open space, trails and active recreation areas including:
 - Naturally landscaped stormwater treatment ponds and bio-retention area
 - Multi-use trail system linking to Alameda Creek Trail
 - Orchard trees and community garden implemented through an Urban Farm

- > Public streets with enhanced intersection paving, crosswalks and landscaping
- Sustainable architecture and landscape design

Development Agreement

The applicant is also requesting approval of a Development Agreement entered into between the property owners and the City. The purpose of the Development Agreement is to vest the development approval over a 15-year time period and also includes the potential for one 5-year extension. The Development Agreement will ensure certain guarantees to the property owners for the right to develop the project as proposed; and, will in return ensure the City receives certain contributions from the property owners. Some of these include:

- Payment of \$9,000,000 for Citywide park development and improvement
- ➤ Payment of \$337,600 into the Traffic Impact Fee program for Citywide street improvements
- Construction of Bay Trail along the Ardenwood Boulevard/Paseo Padre Parkway frontage
- ➤ Construction of City gateway along Ardenwood Boulevard
- ➤ Homeowners Association guarantees for funding and maintenance of all private facilities

The complete terms of the Development Agreement are included as Exhibit "F".

Summary of Related Items:

<u>Open Space Donation</u> — A separate but related item pertains to the remaining lands adjacent to the project site. The approximate 327 remaining acres of the "Patterson Ranch" lands are proposed to be used as follows: (See Informational Item #2)

- ➤ 308 acres donated as permanent public open space to public agencies
- ➤ 10 acres donated for religious facilities (Not considered at this time, subject to future Conditional Use Permit review/approval)
- **8 acres** parkland dedication to the City (No proposal for improvement considered at this time)
- ➤ 1 acre to Union Sanitary District for future construction of a Pump Station (Not related to or caused by the project)

Entitlement requests for lands west of Ardenwood Boulevard are not being considered at this time.

Relationship to Fremont Unified School District (FUSD) – As required by Assembly Bill 50, the project will pay full impact fees to the FUSD anticipated to total approximately \$6-7 million. The project applicant is also proactively working with FUSD to find solutions to address school overcrowding issues in the immediate area.

Remaining Process and Development Timeline - It is anticipated that the project will be built out over a 5-10 year time frame. Remaining entitlements include Tentative Map and Preliminary Grading Plan review and approval and subsequent Final Map and Improvement Plan approval. Site preparation, including remediation and grading, is expected to take 4-6 years. Building permit review and the start of initial construction of structures could happen in that same time frame. The project will be built out over five phases as shown in Informational Item #1, Tentative Phasing Plan.

DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS:

General Plan Conformance

The existing General Plan land use designation for the project site is Open Space, 0.25-1 unit per acre. The applicant is proposing to amend the existing General Plan land use designation for the project site to Low Density Residential, 4-6 units per acre to accommodate the project. See General Plan Amendment Exhibit "B", The following General Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies are applicable to the proposed project:

LAND USE GOAL 1: New housing development while conserving the character of the City's

existing single-family residential neighborhoods.

Policy 1.1: The following list of allowed uses in areas designated for residential use is

descriptive rather than fully inclusive.....Residential use is the primary

allowed use in residentially designated area.

Analysis: The project is consistent with this goal and policy because it proposes to designate the

land Low Density Residential, 4-6 units/acre, consistent with the project.

HOUSING GOAL 2: Ensure availability of high quality, well-designed and environmentally

sustainable new housing of all types throughout the City.

Policy 2.01: Continue to update and apply building codes and adopt and maintain design

standards to ensure development is of high quality, incorporates sustainable measures, and is consistent with the scale and character of the community.

Analysis: The project is consistent with this goal and policy because it provides new single-family

housing in the city. The housing developed will be required to be built to strict design standards contained in the Planned District and will be subject to conformance with 107 points on the Alameda County Build It Green checklist and also be evaluated per the Bay Friendly New Home Landscapes for sustainable measures. The project will also be

developed in conformance with the City's Affordable Housing Ordinance to provide additional affordable housing in the City either directly or through the payment of fees.

OPEN SPACE GOAL 2: Recognition, protection and enhancement of significant natural areas and

wildlife habitats in the City including Bay Tidal, seasonal and freshwater

wetlands and open space meadows and fields.

Objective 2.2: Protection and enhancement of wetlands in the City.

Analysis: The project is consistent with this goal and objective because the applicant proposes to

donate approximately 85 acres of wetlands in the project area to a public agency. The project does propose to fill 0.278 acres of seasonal wetlands, approximately 12,000

square feet, and will replace these wetlands at a 3:1 ratio.

Objective 2.5: A comprehensive system of trails connecting destinations within Fremont.

Analysis: The project is consistent with this objective because it includes significant new trails

within and adjacent to the development including construction of approximately 7,000 linear feet of the publicly accessible Bay Trail and private trails within the development

that link the publicly accessible Alameda Creek Trail.

Open Space Policy 2.5.4: The City shall strongly support the East bay Regional Park District's plans for expanding its parks and trails in Fremont.

Analysis: The project is consistent with this policy because the property owners have proposed a

large donation of remaining lands to East Bay Regional Park District for inclusion into

Coyote Hills Regional Park. The City supports this offer of donation.

Open Space Goal 4: Distinctive Gateways and Roadway Landscaping for Fremont

Analysis: The project is consistent with this goal because it includes the installation of City

gateway and landscape improvements along Ardenwood Boulevard at the City boundary.

NATURAL RESOURCES GOAL 10: Building and Site Design Standards which Conserve Energy

Analysis: The project is consistent with this goal because it includes significant green building,

sustainable landscaping and energy efficient systems. The project will be required to meet 107 point on the Alameda County Build it Green checklist and includes provision

for solar energy use as part of residential design and construction.

PARKS AND RECREATION GOAL 1: Parks and recreation facilities to meet the community's needs.

Analysis: The project is consistent with this goal because it includes approximately 21 acres of

private parks, trails and open space for use by the residents; an 8-acre parkland dedication to the City; payment of Park Facilities Impact Fees; construction of an extension of the Bay Trail; and a contribution of an additional \$9 million for Citywide park development

and improvement pursuant to the development agreement.

Urban Reserve and Study Area Designations

The project site also contains an Urban Reserve and Study Area designation. The Urban Reserve designation is exclusive to this area and was designated when Ardenwood Forest – New Town was established. The intent of the Urban Reserve designation was to identify land for future urban uses at such time that development is warranted. Proposed development of the site is consistent with the Urban Reserve designation which will be removed if the General Plan Amendment is approved.

The Study Area designation applies to areas of the City that have been identified where conversion to an alternative use may be appropriate, but more analysis is required prior to making a final determination on a change in land use. The project site has been designated a Study Area since 1991. Proposed development of the site is consistent with the Study Area designation since appropriate land use and environmental studies have been completed and inform the recommendation for a General Plan Amendment.

Zoning Regulations

The project site is proposed to be rezoned from Agriculture, Agriculture Flood Combining District A, A(F) to Preliminary and Precise Planned District. (See rezoning map Exhibit "C.") As such, new development, use and design standards and guidelines will apply as specified in the Planned District Guidelines (Exhibit "E"). The standards are based on existing zoning regulations as they apply to the R-1-6 zoning district, including the Small Lot Single-Family Design Guidelines, the zoning district most similar to the project. The project is consistent with all applicable Small Lot Design Guidelines, including guidelines related to Site Planning; Lot Plans and Building Configuration; Building Design, Elements, Materials and Color; and Open Space and Landscaping.

The zoning provides for up to 500 single-family homes. The zoning also allows for the open space, parks, trails, streets, sidewalks and all design details being proposed with the project. The standards for site plan and architecture review and future processing of the Planned District are incorporated into the Planned District Development Standards and Design Guidelines (Exhibit "E") and Conditions of Approval (Exhibit "G").

Some exceptions to the R-1-6 zoning district standard requirements are proposed, which include reduced building setbacks for street side and rear yards and lack of direct public street frontage for the 3,300 square foot lots. Auto courts and access easements will be provided for the 3,300 square foot lots to provide secure vehicular access to the public street. However, the exceptions are consistent with the Small Lot Single Family Design Guidelines and still achieve the intent for safety, privacy, emergency access and open space.

Parking

The project provides two covered and two uncovered off-street parking spaces per residential lot in compliance with the minimum parking standards for single-family homes. In addition, on-street parking is also provided. The project meets the requirements pursuant to Article 20, Parking Regulations, in the Fremont Municipal Code.

Affordable Housing

The project is subject to the Affordable Housing Ordinance. The applicant proposes comply with the affordable housing ordinance by payment of in-lieu fees. The amount to be paid will be based on the fee in effect at the time of building permit issuance or otherwise determined by the Affordable Housing Ordinance. The approximate estimate of the in-lieu fees to be paid over time will likely be based upon a \$19.50 per square foot amount which goes into effect July 1, 2013. However, the exact dollar amount of will vary depending on the fee in effect at time of building permit issuance. It is estimated that the project will eventually generate \$15-22 million dollars for affordable housing in the City.

Design Analysis:

Site Planning

The site is located adjacent to two primary arterials, Ardenwood Boulevard and Paseo Padre Parkway, and will be served by both. The site is divided into eight neighborhoods and various parks and open spaces. A large circular drive dominates the center of the site and loop streets branch out from it providing access to the neighborhoods. The outside of the drive will not contain parking, thereby allowing the landscape planter to be increased to nine feet in width. Large canopy shade trees will be

planted along the drive and all streets. A bridge connects to the triangular neighborhood across Crandall Creek. The site plan maximizes access to the residential lots by looped streets and minimal cul-de-sacs. A perimeter trail and sidewalks along all streets provide complete pedestrian access. Enhanced intersection paving and cross-walks, and landscaping add to the pedestrian friendliness of the site. The open spaces are strategically placed to serve as focal points and provide visibility from the street.

Architecture

Several architectural styles were chosen for the homes including, French Country, Tudor, Craftsmen, California Spanish and Spanish Adobe. The City will allow flexibility in the architectural design given the anticipated build out of the project as long as building envelopes and square footages do not change. The City will encourage Craftsmen, Prairie Style, Early Californian, Bungalows, and diversity in style that reflect the location of the site. Architectural guidelines are included in the Planned District Development Standards and Design Guidelines, Exhibit E.

Green Building Technologies

The applicant has proposed a substantial green building and sustainable landscape measure program. A summary of the measures are as follows:

Green Building

- 1. Homes designed to meet minimum 107 points per Alameda County Green Building "Build it Green" checklist, or other method adopted by the City, prior to building permit submittal.
- 2. Homes to be certified as "Green Rated" per above and upon completion of construction.

Solar/Renewable Energy

- 1. Streets/homes oriented to maximize solar orientation.
- 2. Homes structurally designed to carry roof top load of solar panels.
- 3. Homes electrically designed for solar electricity.
- 4. Roof design oriented to maximize solar exposure and solar panel placement.
- 5. Builder optional installation of solar panels at time of construction.

Ranch House and Barn

Designed to achieve LEED certification

Other

- 1. All homes to have electric car charging stations installed in all garages.
- 2. All homes to have energy efficient water heaters.

Open Space/Landscape Design

A substantial open space, parks and landscape design is proposed for the project. Approximately 21 acres of parks and open space are proposed. The primary park and open space features are described as follows:

Porchard Park and Stormwater Pond Area (up to 5 acres) – An orchard area is located at the main entry of the project along Ardenwood Boulevard. Adjacent to the orchard to the north is a stormwater treatment pond designed as a natural feature. The purpose of the pond is to treat

stormwater runoff from the project site before it is discharged into Crandall Creek and the Bay. See Landscape Sheet L-5.

- Major Entry Feature (1 acre) At the northeast corner of Ardenwood Boulevard and Paseo Padre Parkway an entry feature will be located to identify Patterson Ranch. This feature will include a farming related structure and landscaping plantings. The final design of this feature is subject to further review at time of tentative map approval.
- ➤ Urban Farm Park (up to 5 acres) A crescent shaped park is located as a focal point as you enter the site off Ardenwood Boulevard. This area is planned to be the center of activity for the community. It will contain a community center for use by the residents and a barn to store materials for the Farm. The Farm will contain an orchard, gardening plots and community building available for farming use by the residents of the community. The Farm will be professionally managed See Landscape Sheet L-10.
- Active Park (up to 3 acres) At the opposite end as the Urban Farm, an active park is planned with two tennis courts, one basketball court and active and passive play areas. It will include picnic areas and benches as well. See Landscape Sheet L-11.
- Passive Park (up to 3 acres) Surrounded by Neighborhood 8, this park is intended as a stormwater treatment facility and bio-retention area. The park will include a trail, benches, small group picnic area and other passive features. See Landscape Sheet L-6.
- ➤ Park Trail (up to 5 acres) A perimeter trail is located around the edge of the site along Crandall Creek, the railroad and Paseo Padre Parkway. This trail links all the neighborhoods to the Alameda Creek Trail. See trail cross-section on Sheet L-8, similar to Bay Trail.
- Passive Native Area and Trail Access (up to 1 acre) This area is located near the bridge over Crandall Creek and will be furnished with benches and a picnic area in decomposed granite paving and concrete walkways connecting the trail to the sidewalk.

The overall landscape design will incorporate many sustainable features per the Bay Friendly Landscape Guidelines. These Guidelines will apply to all common areas and front yards of all homes. Some features in particular include the following:

- Use of Bay-Friendly Scorecard for New Home Landscapes
- 10% maximum lawn/turf area for front yards and common areas excluding active areas
- 75% minimum use of native and drought tolerant plant materials
- 100% landscaped based stormwater treatment
- Recyclable materials will be integrated into pavement and park/street furniture to extent practical

View Impacts

The project location is in a picturesque setting near Coyote Hills Regional Park and the San Francisco Bay. The project site is surrounded by existing development on three sides and is buffered by remaining open space lands west of Ardenwood Boulevard. Proposed development is generally consistent in size, scale and height to surrounding development. The development is not anticipated to block any views

from adjacent properties. Although the project will change the appearance of the site from a vacant field to developed residential uses, view impacts were not considered significant.

Circulation

The proposed development is located at the intersection of Ardenwood Boulevard and Paseo Parkway, which are arterial streets with full street improvements along the project's frontage. Ardenwood Boulevard will be further improved with bike lanes and widening along sections of the project frontage (See Informational Exhibit #3). A new intersection will also be installed midway along Ardenwood with Ranch Drive, a new street providing access to the project. A new access point will also be installed along Paseo Padre Parkway at Tupelo Street, which will be extended into the project site.

The internal circulation consists of a network of public streets highlighted by large circular drive in the center of the site. The circular drive provides multiple points of access to the residential lots and will distribute traffic evenly throughout the site. Most streets are looped and minimal cul-de-sacs are proposed. A vehicular bridge provides access to Neighborhood 8. A second point of access will be provided to this area along the Alameda Creek Trail right of way.

Neighborhoods 1 and 6 include clusters of four homes with vehicular and pedestrian access provided by an auto court. The lots in the back of the auto court, furthest from the public street, lack the street frontage required in the Subdivision Ordinance and in the R-1 zoning district. In lieu of street frontage, the project provides access to the public street by reciprocal access easements between the four lots. The auto courts are consistent with the Small-Lot Single-Family Design Guidelines.

Neighborhood 8, Lots 32 through 35, are served by a private street that runs parallel to the railroad tracks. The private street also connects the internal public street with the trail and emergency vehicle access (EVA) along Alameda Creek. Because this private street serves more than the four lots this private street shall be a separate common area parcel owned and maintained by the homeowners association. The access roadway for these lots exceeds 150 feet in length and therefore required to have an approved turnaround. The access roads shall meet Fire Department standards for surface type, distance, weight loads, turn radius, grades, and vertical clearance.

The pedestrian circulation system is quite extensive. All streets include sidewalks and a perimeter trail provides access to all neighborhoods and links to the Alameda Creek Trail. A new section of the Bay Trail is also included in the project. It will be installed along the western edge of Ardenwood Boulevard and along the northern edge of Paseo Padre Parkway. All project trails shall be designed per City Standards. Pedestrian access easements that are provided to open space areas between lots shall have a minimum width of twenty feet.

Grading & Drainage

The applicant proposes to import approximately 300,000 cubic yards of soil to raise the site anywhere from approximately one to four feet. The purpose of importing the soil is to provide positive drainage flow for the storm drain system. The proposed storm drain is a City standard, gravity flow system that will outfall to Crandall Creek. It will take approximately 17,000 truck trips and up to five years to haul all the material to the site. The location where material will be imported from has not been identified. The truck route that will be used to haul soil to the site will be along Route 84 to Paseo Padre Parkway which will minimize potential impacts to adjacent uses. No residential uses are located along this route.

More refined detail of the grading and fill operation will be presented at such time preliminary grading plan approval is requested.

Geotechnical Considerations

The project site is within a liquefaction zone, as shown on the official Seismic Hazard Zone maps issued by the State Geologist. A liquefaction analysis was performed by the project geotechnical engineer, Terrasearch, Inc., in January 2008, and supplements an earlier Terrasearch geotechnical investigation report (2000). The project geotechnical report anticipates settlement up to 4 inches, due to consolidation of Bay Mud layers below the surface. Half of the settlement is estimated to occur during site grading and construction of the site. The EIR includes measures (GEO-3a, GEO-3b, and GEO-3c) to mitigate the anticipated settlement and reduce risks to buildings.

Regarding the potential impact of settlement on the proposed public streets, the geotechnical analysis recommends over-excavating and re-compacting surface soils and using geogrid reinforcement to minimize cracking of street pavements. The analysis also includes a recommendation to design gravity-flow utilities (sewer and storm drain) to compensate for anticipated differential settlements. The project geotechnical engineer proposes completing design-level geotechnical investigations prior to project construction. The design-level geotechnical investigations shall include recommendations for the design and construction of public infrastructure improvements that perform to City standards and compensate for anticipated differential settlements.

Floodway Designation/FEMA

The project site includes a Floodway designation and is located in FEMA Zone "A" and "AE", special flood hazard areas subject to inundation by the one percent annual chance flood. However, the applicant has applied for and received a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) from FEMA to revise the flood maps for this area. The applicant has adequately shown through hydrologic data and modeling that past improvements to the Crandall Creek channel has increased the ability of the channel to contain increased surface flows typical with larger storm events and the one percent annual chance flood. The applicant's request remains conditional until the project is 100% complete and it can be demonstrated that the conditions in the application to FEMA remain the same and the project is certified built as proposed. FEMA will then issue a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) to revise the Flood Insurance Rate Panel (FIRM) for this area. Hence, future home owners would not be required to purchase flood insurance for their home. The applicant's request from FEMA is exclusive from any project approval requested by the City.

Frontage Improvements

The project will be responsible for frontage improvements along Ardenwood Boulevard and Paso Padre Parkway per the City Street Right-of-Way and Improvement Ordinance, including appropriate travel lanes, bike lanes, and sidewalks and landscaping. The frontage improvement along Ardenwood Boulevard shall be consistent with Informational Exhibit #4.

Utility Districts

The project site is located within the Alameda County Water District (ACWD) for domestic water service and Union Sanitary District (USD) for sanitary sewer service. Formal annexation of the site into the USD service area will be required. Both Districts have stated that they will be able to serve the project.

FISCAL IMPACT: Not applicable.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared for the proposed project, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The purpose of an EIR is to act as an informational document that:

- Describes the proposed project in substantial detail, provides the project objectives, establishes the environmental setting, and identifies the potentially significant environmental effects of the project;
- Identifies feasible ways to minimize the significance of potential environmental effects;
- Discusses reasonable alternatives to the project that minimize, reduce, or avoid identified environmental effects.

The EIR is not intended to recommend either approval or denial of a project. Instead, the EIR process is intended to inform decision makers and the public about the potential environmental effects of a project to facilitate informed decision making. The EIR process includes preparation of a Draft EIR, and in this case, publication of a Recirculated Draft EIR, that is available for public comment for a minimum of 45 days. The Recirculated Draft EIR for the proposed project was circulated for public review from June 21, 2010 through August 5, 2010. Preparation of the Final EIR occurs at the conclusion of the Draft EIR comment period and includes responses to comments made on the Recirculated Draft EIR and any clarifying revisions to the Recirculated Draft EIR. The Final EIR for this project was made available for public review and delivered to Planning Commission members on September 10, 2010. Collectively, the documents are referred to as the "EIR."

Prior to acting on a proposed action, the Lead Agency must certify the EIR as adequate. To determine adequacy of an EIR, the Lead Agency must determine the sufficiency of the information in the document, not the correctness of its conclusions. Legal adequacy of an EIR is generally characterized by the following:

- All required contents are included;
- An objective, good-faith effort at full disclosure of potential environmental effects is provided;
- A reasonable treatment of issues is provided;
- Disagreement among experts is acceptable;
- Perfection is not required;
- Exhaustive treatment of issues is not required; and
- Minor technical defects are not necessarily fatal.

Proposed Project Analysis:

An EIR was prepared to consider and analyze the environmental effects of the proposed project. The proposed project as analyzed in the EIR includes development of 111 acres of a 428-acre project area for up to 520 residential units and associated infrastructure improvements. Since the time the Draft EIR was circulated, the overall project size has been reduced to 500 residential units. As such, the EIR provides a more conservative analysis of the potential project effects. Also as part of the project, site preparation activities, including soil remediation, material import, grading, infrastructure improvements and two religious facilities were analyzed. The EIR analyzed the direct and indirect effects of the activities associated with the proposed project including the impacts of all recommended mitigation measures.

Significant Effects and Mitigation:

The EIR identified potential impacts in 11 topical areas, including: Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Noise; Public Utilities and Energy; and Transportation. Four additional topics analyzed in the initial study were determined to have less-than-significant impacts, including: Land Use; Population and Housing; and Parks and Recreation; and Schools and Libraries.

For each of these 11 topics for which potential impacts were identified, further analysis of the impacts was completed in the EIR prepared for the project. Recommended mitigation measures would reduce the identified impacts for each of these topics to a less-than-significant level, excepting for five identified impacts in the topics of Agricultural Resources, Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Mineral Resources and Sea Level Rise. The Draft and Final EIR include mitigation measures, which, if implemented, would reduce the identified impacts to non-significant levels. These mitigation measures are summarized in the Final EIR and MMRP, Exhibit "A".

Significant and Unavoidable Impacts:

As noted, the EIR identified significant environmental effects in the topical areas of Agricultural Resources, Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Mineral Resources and Sea Level Rise that could not be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation. These impacts are as follows:

- 1) Agriculture Loss of Prime Agricultural Land (Cumulative Impact also) When the Notice of Preparation was released for the EIR in October 2007 the land was classified as Prime Agricultural Land by the State Department of Conservation. The land was re-classified as grazing land in 2008 because it has not been irrigated for the past four years. However, the soils continue to have high value for agriculture. Mitigation is proposed to reduce this impact; however, it would not fully reduce it to a less-than-significant level because the site would be permanently lost for agriculture use. As a result, the impact is significant and unavoidable.
- Air Quality Net emission increase in Reactive Organic Gases (Cumulative Impact also) The proposed project's operational emissions would exceed Bay Area Air Quality Management District's daily threshold of 54 lbs/day for reactive organic gases (ROG). Mitigation recommended by the Air District is incorporated into the project or proposed as additional mitigation to reduce this impact; however, it would not fully reduce it to a less-than-significant level (below 54 lbs/day. As a result, the impact is significant and unavoidable.
- 3) Air Quality Conflict with 2005 Bay Area Ozone Strategy (Cumulative Impact also) The proposed project conflicts with implementation of the 2005 Bay Area Ozone Strategy because the development of the site was not included in populations and traffic projections used by the District in preparing the 2005 Plan. Consequently, the impacts of the project on the 2005 Ozone Strategy are considered to be significant. While mitigation is proposed to reduce this cumulative impact, it cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level if any development is permitted on the site. As a result, the impact is significant and unavoidable.
- 4) Air Quality Temporary increase in dust/diesel emissions Emissions of dust and diesel exhaust during construction of the project would exceed Air Quality District's daily thresholds for

nitrogen oxides (NO_X) during the construction phase of the project. The Air Quality District considers NO_X emissions to be significant if they exceed 54 lbs/day. Although the best available control measures as identified by the Air District have been adopted as mitigation measures, emissions would continue to exceed 54 lbs/day, and these impacts would therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

- Mineral Resources Prevent extraction of regionally significant mineral resources (Cumulative Impact also) The project site has been identified by the State as having regionally significant mineral resources. The development of the project area would prevent the extraction of regionally significant sand and gravel deposits although extraction of these resources could also have significant impacts. There is no feasible mitigation and as a result, the impact is significant and unavoidable.
- 6) Greenhouse Gas Emissions Net increase in GHG emissions (Cumulative Impact) Greenhouse gas emissions would exceed the Air Quality District's threshold of 4.6 metric tons CO₂ per capita per year. While the mitigation measures incorporated in into the project have reduced per capita emissions from 6.07 to 5.5 metric tons per capita per year, and additional mitigation measures would further reduce emissions, per capita emissions would still exceed 4.6 metric tons per capita per year. No additional mitigation measures have been able to be identified that would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. As a result, the impact is significant and unavoidable.
- 7) Cumulative Long Term Sea Level Rise The project would develop land that is located within areas of projected tidal inundation due to sea level rise, which would place people and structures within a flood hazard associated with long-term sea level rise. Although the project would mitigate impacts as a result of projected sea level rise to 2050, possible substantial changes to the regional drainage system and the precise amount of sea level rise to 2100 cannot be predicted with certainty at this time. Although the adopted mitigation measures require that future increases in levee height be accommodated to accommodate expected sea level rise to 2100, due to uncertainty about future sea level rise, the impact is significant and unavoidable.

Statement of Overriding Considerations:

CEQA requires public agencies to balance the benefits of a project against its significant environmental effects when determining whether or not to approve it. CEQA defines benefits as economic, legal, social, technological, or other. If a project's benefits outweigh its unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse effects may be considered "acceptable." When a public agency approves a project with significant effects that are not avoided or substantially lessened with mitigation or changes to the project, the agency must state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the EIR and/or other information in the record. Because no level of mitigation would lessen the identified significant and unavoidable impacts to a less-than-significant level, the City Council must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations that, on balance, the benefits of the project outweigh the significant and unavoidable impacts. Benefits of the project include:

- 1. Inclusion of substantial green building and sustainable landscape measures
- 2. Provision of affordable housing either through construction or in-lieu fee
- 3. Construction of housing to assist in meeting regional needs

- 4. Urban farm, community garden and unique open space amenities
- 5. Bay trail improvement
- 6. Installation of city gateway
- 7. Consolidated development plan to east of Ardenwood Boulevard
- 8. Preservation of wetlands, Patterson Slough and unique biological resources
- 9. Ardenwood Boulevard improvement
- 10. Two new signalized intersections installed with project
- 11. Monetary contribution to City for city-wide park and street improvements

Alternatives Analysis:

The EIR also considered three alternatives to the proposed project. The CEQA Guidelines require an analysis of a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the project's basic objectives and avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. The emphasis of the analysis is a comparison of the anticipated impacts of each alternative to the impacts associated with the proposed project, including a discussion as to whether or not each alternative would reduce, eliminate, or create new significant impacts.

The three alternatives analyzed include:

1) No Project Alternative: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6 (e)(3)(A), when a project is a revision to an existing land use or regulatory plan, the No Project alternative will be the continuation of the existing land use or regulatory plan for the project site. In the case of the project area, the area is designated Open Space, Institutional Open Space, and Private Open Space in Fremont's General Plan and is zoned Agriculture, Agriculture-Flood Combining, and Open Space Flood Combining.

The general plan designations allow for a variety of uses including open space, agriculture, low density residential, and parks, among others. The zoning, however, allows for primarily agriculture uses. This alternative assumes agricultural land uses on 341 acres as allowed under the existing general plan and zoning designations. Additional farm-related structures could be built in the project area, including residences for farm workers. For purposes of this analysis construction of two residential structures has been assumed as a reasonable amount of housing for workers on a single farm of this size. No other development is assumed, though rehabilitation of the existing buildings on the site could occur for farm use.

No Build Alternative: This alternative assumes the use of the land for existing purposes, specifically vacant land tilled occasionally to control weeds and open space. Under this alternative, no future development would occur within the project area. The existing structures onsite would remain and all existing uses in the project area would continue into the future. Under Alternative 1 no new structures would be built and no new human occupation or use of the project area would occur. Project impacts related to construction, new buildings, and human occupation of the site would therefore be completely avoided. Because tilling of the project area would still be allowed, this alternative would continue to have the potential to impact biological resources and cultural resources. The remaining issue areas are not discussed further since this alternative would not result in impacts in these categories.

3) Reduced Development Alternative: Implementation of this alternative would allow for the future development of 355 residential single-family units, associated neighborhood parks and trails, an 8-acre community park, and two religious facilities on the east side of Ardenwood Boulevard. The donation of 316 acres to a public agency, and donation of 1 acre to the Union Sanitary District (USD) for a pump station is also proposed under this alternative. The future use of this pump station is not part of the environmental evaluation. Development of this alternative would require grading activities similar to the project. This would include raising portions of the project area, in particular along Crandall Creek (K-line channel) and the Alameda County flood control channels. Soils from the western portion of the site, as well as imported material, if needed, would be redistributed throughout the area east of Ardenwood Boulevard to raise the elevations for proposed roadways, buildings, and infrastructure.

Environmentally Superior Alternative:

CEQA requires that the EIR identify the environmentally superior alternative. Each of the proposed alternatives would have fewer environmental impacts relative to the proposed project, with the *No Project/No Build Alternative* having the fewest. Therefore, the *No Project/No Build Alternative* is the environmentally superior alternative, as the project site would remain in its existing condition, thereby avoiding any potentially adverse environmental impacts. Pursuant to CEQA, if the *No Project/No Development Alternative* is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives.

Based on this review, the *Reduced Development Alternative* is considered the environmentally superior alternative because it would have reduced impacts related to air quality, emergency services, greenhouse gas emissions and energy, hydrology and water quality, noise and vibration, population and housing, public utilities and solid waste, transportation and circulation since it is a small project. This alternative would generate a population of 1,065 individuals, which are 495 fewer individuals than the proposed project. Because there would be fewer people on the site, this would reduce impacts to air quality, noise, public service demands, and generation of vehicle trips and greenhouse gas emissions.

Although the EIR identifies the Reduced Development Alternative as "environmentally superior," it eliminates none of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the project and develops the same area as would be developed with the project. It is not clear that impacts would be reduced on a regional or statewide basis, because those persons displaced from the site would need to live in housing located elsewhere, which could be in areas farther removed from transit and other services. A reduction in the number of units developed on the site could impede the City's ability to meet its regional housing needs, especially in the Housing Element that will be due in 2014. Finally, the property owners have not agreed to the terms of the development agreement if this alternative is approved.

ENCLOSURES

- Exhibit "A" Draft resolution certifying the final EIR, making findings, and adopting a Mitigation Monitoring Report Program (MMRP) and statement of overriding considerations
- Exhibit "B" Draft resolution amending General Plan Land Use Diagram
- Exhibit "C" Draft ordinance rezoning Planned District
- Exhibit "D" Illustrative Concept Plan (P-1), Precise Site Plan (P-2), Lot Plans (A6-7, A13-14, A20-21, A27-28), Landscape Plans and Park Design Details (L1-12), Community Building Floor Plan and Elevation (A29-30)

- Exhibit "E" Planned District Development Standards and Design Guidelines
- Exhibit "F" Draft ordinance adopting Development Agreement
- Exhibit "G" Findings and Conditions of Approval
- <u>Informational Item 1 Architectural Elevations and Floor Plans and Tentative Phasing Plan</u> (included in Informational appendix Exhibit "D")
- <u>Informational Item 2 Letter from applicant regarding remaining lands</u>
- Informational Item 3 Ardenwood Boulevard Improvement Concept
- Informational Item 4 Draft Planning Commission Minutes (September 23 and 30, 2010)
- Informational Item 5 Correspondence received during Planning Commission

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1. Hold public hearing.
- 2. Adopt a resolution certifying that the Final Environmental Impact Report (Exhibit "A") has been completed in compliance with the requirements of CEQA, and that the City Council has considered the information contained in the Final EIR and that it reflects the City Council's independent judgment and analysis; making findings of fact related to impacts, and adopting a mitigation monitoring and reporting program and a statement of overriding considerations.
- 3. Adopt a resolution approving a General Plan Land Use Amendment from Open Space, 0.25-1 unit/acre, Study Area #12 and Urban Reserve to Residential Low, 4-6 units per acre, and eliminating the "Study Area" designation on lands westerly of Ardenwood Boulevard as shown on Exhibit "B" (General Plan Amendment Land Use Diagram).
- 4. Waive full reading and introduce an ordinance Rezoning the subject property from Agriculture and Agriculture (Flood Combining) to Planned District P-2005-186, as shown on Exhibit "C" (Planned District Rezoning Map), and a Preliminary and Precise Planned District P-2005-186 as shown on Exhibit "D" (Illustrative Plan, Precise Site Plan, Lot Plans, Landscape Plans and Park Design Details and Community Building Floor Plan and Elevations) finding the project conforms to the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan Small Lot Single Family Design Guidelines, with the development standards design guidelines set forth in Exhibit "E" and subject to findings and conditions as set forth in Exhibit "G."
- 5. Find the Development Agreement, as shown on Exhibit "F," fulfills the applicable requirements set forth in the Fremont Municipal Code based upon findings set forth in Exhibit "G," and waive full reading and introduce an ordinance approving a the Development Agreement.

6.1	Report Out from Closed Session of Any Final Action

- 8.1 Council Referrals None.
- 8.2 Oral Reports on Meetings and Events

ACRONYMS

ABAGAssociation of Bay Area Governments	FUSD Fremont Unified School District
ACCMAAlameda County Congestion	GIS Geographic Information System
Management Agency	GPA General Plan Amendment
ACEAltamont Commuter Express	HARB Historical Architectural Review Board
ACFCDAlameda County Flood Control District	HBA Home Builders Association
ACTAAlameda County Transportation	HRC Human Relations Commission
Authority	ICMA International City/County Management
ACTIAAlameda County Transportation	Association
Improvement Authority	JPA Joint Powers Authority
ACWDAlameda County Water District	LLMD Lighting and Landscaping Maintenance
BAAQMD Bay Area Air Quality Management	District
District	LOCC League of California Cities
BARTBay Area Rapid Transit District	LOS Level of Service
BCDCBay Conservation & Development	MOU Memorandum of Understanding
Commission	MTC Metropolitan Transportation Commission
BMPsBest Management Practices	NEPA National Environmental Policy Act
BMRBelow Market Rate	NLC National League of Cities
CALPERSCalifornia Public Employees' Retirement	NPDES National Pollutant Discharge Elimination
System	System
CBDCentral Business District	NPO Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance
CDDCommunity Development Department	PC Planning Commission
CC & R's Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions	PD Planned District
CDBGCommunity Development Block Grant	PUC Public Utilities Commission
CEQACalifornia Environmental Quality Act	PVAW Private Vehicle Accessway
CERTCommunity Emergency Response Team	PWCPublic Works Contract
CIPCapital Improvement Program	RDA Redevelopment Agency
CMACongestion Management Agency	RFP Request for Proposals
CNGCompressed Natural Gas	RFQ Request for Qualifications
COFCity of Fremont	RHNA Regional Housing Needs Allocation
COPPSCommunity Oriented Policing and Public	ROP Regional Occupational Program
Safety	RRIDRO Residential Rent Increase Dispute
CSACCalifornia State Association of Counties	Resolution Ordinance
CTCCalifornia Transportation Commission	RWQCB Regional Water Quality Control Board
dBDecibel	SACNET Southern Alameda County Narcotics
DEIRDraft Environmental Impact Report	Enforcement Task Force
DODevelopment Organization	SPAA Site Plan and Architectural Approval
DU/ACDwelling Units per Acre	STIP State Transportation Improvement
EBRPDEast Bay Regional Park District	Program
EDAC Economic Development Advisory	TCRDF Tri-Cities Recycling and Disposal Facility
Commission (City)	T&O Transportation and Operations
EIREnvironmental Impact Report (CEQA)	Department
EISEnvironmental Impact Statement (NEPA)	TOD Transit Oriented Development
ERAFEducation Revenue Augmentation Fund	TS/MRF Transfer Station/Materials Recovery
EVAWEmergency Vehicle Accessway	Facility
FARFloor Area Ratio	UBC Uniform Building Code
FEMAFederal Emergency Management Agency	USD Union Sanitary District
FFDFremont Fire Department	VTA Santa Clara Valley Transportation
FMCFremont Municipal Code	Authority
FPDFremont Police Department	WMA Waste Management Authority
FRCFamily Resource Center	ZTAZoning Text Amendment
•	5

UPCOMING MEETING AND CHANNEL 27 BROADCAST SCHEDULE

21.07.1207.01 301123022				
Date	Time	Meeting Type	Location	Cable Channel 27
November 2, 2010	7:00 p.m.	City Council Meeting	Council Chambers	Live
November 9, 2010	7:00 p.m.	City Council Meeting	Council Chambers	Live
November 16, 2010	6:00 p.m.	Work Session	Council Chambers	Live
November 23, 2010	7:00 p.m.	City Council Meeting	Council Chambers	Live
November 30, 2010 (5 th Tuesday)		No City Council Meeting		
December 7, 2010	7:00 p.m.	City Council Meeting	Council Chambers	Live
December 14, 2010	7:00 p.m.	City Council Meeting	Council Chambers	Live
December 15, 2010 – January 3, 2011		Council Recess		
January 4, 2011	7:00 p.m.	City Council Meeting	Council Chambers	Live
January 11, 2011	7:00 p.m.	City Council Meeting	Council Chambers	Live
January 18, 2011	TBD	Work Session	Council Chambers	Live
January 25, 2011	7:00 p.m.	City Council Meeting	Council Chambers	Live
February 1, 2011	7:00 p.m.	City Council Meeting	Council Chambers	Live
February 8, 2011	7:00 p.m.	City Council Meeting	Council Chambers	Live
February 15, 2011	TBD	Work Session	Council Chambers	Live
February 22, 2011	7:00 p.m.	City Council Meeting	Council Chambers	Live